

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

17th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XVII, Number 15

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

October 1, 1987

Despite Woeful Report to NSF

Organic Chemists' Plea for Funds Gets No Reaction in Washington

It is arguable whether chemistry is denied equity at the federal trough, or simply that chemistry inspires its practitioners to particularly distinguished pleading for more.

In either case, or whatever the combination, chemistry has long occupied a notable place in the promotional literature of budget boosting. Legendary are the blockbuster reports of Professors Westheimer (1965) and Pimentel (1985). And now, though in much briefer form, the genre has been enriched with a spellbinding brief, flowing with grim anecdotal detail and dour observations. Though focused on the treatment of basic organic chemistry in the National Science Foundation, it concludes that "pain and wasted human resources are a widespread and endemic problem" in all the chemical disciplines.

Produced, at NSF's invitation, by an 11-member committee co-chaired by two UC Berkeley chemists, Robert G. Bergman and Clayton H. Heathcock, the latest report on the field was delivered in April to the Foundation. It has since been the subject of several meetings

NIH Raps Cornell in Misconduct Case—P. 5 ***Fraud Finding Costs Pitt \$163,000—P. 6***

involving some of the authors and senior NSF officials, including two summits with Director Erich Bloch, the most recent in August. The report's view of the world has been officially endorsed by the advisory committee of the NSF Division of Chemistry.

As literature, it is a success. But, it is necessary to note, this compendium of neglect has not resulted in additional money for organic or any other kind of chemistry, or the prospect of any beyond the normal pace of growth that preceded the report. NSF spends about \$93 million a year on chemistry, of which organic chemistry shares \$28 million (by NSF's account); there are no plans to alter the proportions, which have been fairly stable for many years.

Are the authors disappointed in the outcome of their report? No, co-Chairman Heathcock told SGR. He takes the view that some time is needed for the message to sink in, and that a good start has been made. SGR has asked around, and, for reasons that remain undetectable, everyone involved seems similarly happy about the report and NSF's expressions of interest in it. Within the NSF Chemistry Division, they seem pleased, too,

(Continued on page 2)

So Much for Internationalism

Super Collider Review Trims 7, Leaving 36 Sites in Running

International collaboration and cost sharing have been serenaded as cherished goals by the promoters of the \$4.4-billion Superconducting Super Collider (SSC). But the only proposal for an international site—an area straddling the New York-Canadian border—is among seven offerings that the Department of Energy (DOE) has swiftly ruled out as not meeting the "basic qualification criteria." Specifically cited by DOE as grounds for dismissal was a requirement for a "Location entirely in the United States of America."

The seven rejects were culled by DOE from the 43 proposals in 25 states received at last month's deadline. The review process now switches to the National Academy of Sciences, where a blue-ribbon committee is to

(Continued on page 3)

In Brief

Federal R&D managers are grouching about the lack of "new" money to finance the "superconductivity initiative" that the President announced in July. DoD, he said, "will spend nearly \$150 million over three years," thus raising expectations of a spurt in R&D spending. But the money is simply being shifted out of other R&D programs, many already on tight budgets. At the Department of Energy, which has shuffled \$11 million to superconductivity, "we've had to 'eat' everything," an administrator told SGR.

The politically untouchable issue of too many medical schools in the US lurks behind a new study on physician supply organized by the Association of American Medical Colleges. Chaired by Daniel C. Tosteson, Dean of Harvard Medical School, it's organizing for a two-year inquiry into doctor-population ratios, new technology, AIDS-care manpower, and other issues. Applications for medical school have slumped, but admissions and enrollments remain almost unchanged from peak years. Closure of some marginal state schools is whispered about, but, politically, they're tougher to zap than a military base.

Research in engineering schools boomed by 13 percent, for a total of \$1.6 billion, between academic years 1984-5 and 1985-6, according to the American Society for Engineering Education. Details are in "Engineering College Research and Graduate Study 1987" (320 pages), available for \$19.00 (\$9.00 for students) from ASEE, Suite 200, Eleven DuPont Circle, Washington, DC 20036; tel. 202/293-7080.

... Chemists Says Politics Boosts "Big Science"

(Continued from page 1)

though we were advised that nothing special is planned to alleviate the many difficulties enumerated in the report, apart from organic chemistry sharing in the doubled budget that NSF wistfully seeks by 1992.

Perhaps there is a cathartic effect in having the difficulties spelled out for the moneygivers in Washington. Last month, during their annual meeting, in New Orleans, the chemists were lamenting their situation at the National Institutes of Health, which will actually outspend NSF in chemistry by some \$47 million this year. Not bad, it might be concluded, but the chemists gloomily note that what they're getting amounts to a mere 2.7 percent of NIH's budget.

Science's cries of neglect are so much a part of the background noise in Washington that they're easily ignored or quickly forgotten. But oblivion in the archives of the Foundation should not be the fate of the report of the Special NSF Committee on Funding of Organic Chemistry Research. In the course of its work, it invited comments from 60 groups of university-based chemists and it got back 50 replies, from which it distilled a number of observations and conclusions. These reflect the distrustful state of mind with which some, if not

many, researchers regard recent policy changes at NSF.

One of the report's assertions—stated but undocumented—is that "The trend toward 'big science' at the expense of single-investigator research is accelerating, for political reasons. It is easier for the NSF to secure budget increases from Congress and the Administrative Branch if new programs of high visibility are proposed.

"An example," the report continued, "is seen in the FY88 budget proposed by the President, which includes a significant (17 percent) increase for the NSF. Most of this increase is allocated for new special programs, such as Science and Technology Centers. In the Directorate of Mathematical and Physical Sciences alone, \$50 million is earmarked for 15-30 such centers. If there are later cuts in the NSF budget from the optimistic 17-percent increase promised by the President, it is probable that the full amount destined for the new Center program will be retained. Thus, the amount of NSF money available for support of individual research grants in the core program could decrease, even if the overall NSF budget increases."

NSF's expansion of its centers program—the controversial centerpiece of the Bloch regime (SGR July 1,

(Continued on page 3)

Chemist's Lament: When Physicists Circle Wagons, They Fire Outward

Thick gloom was dished out when the NSF Committee on Funding Organic Chemistry Research asked its professional kin in academe to comment on the state of the discipline. The following are from statements anonymously quoted in the Committee's report:

- . . . physical organic chemistry has been virtually eliminated as an American discipline because of insufficient funding over the last 15 years. It now appears that organic synthesis will suffer the same fate; the balance of power in organic chemistry will continue to swing to Japan.

- One especially deserving 'old' individual had his funding cut on a recent . . . renewal from \$362,000 (three years) to \$54,000 for one year only. This followed a three-year period of productivity that produced 22 publications from work supported by the grant.

- [Physical organic chemists] are slowly being driven toward extinction by the unavailability of sufficient NSF support. As they drop from the ranks of research-active faculty, they train no new practitioners of their craft.

- . . . there is so little money in the NSF that it takes one less-than-enthusiastic review to destroy a funding opportunity.

- There is a wide perception among bright young students that the US government really doesn't care about research in organic chemistry and consequently that it is not a wise career choice.

- NSF support is viewed as erratic and unreliable.

- There seems to be less money for traditional areas of chemistry, even though overall budgets in NSF appear to be going up in a healthy way.

- There seems to be a perception that since physical organic chemists don't have respectable-size groups, they don't need them. Of course, the reality is that they don't have them because they can't afford them.

- I believe that a conscious decision has been made at top level of the NSF to decrease the level of funding of organic chemistry.

- We personally know of numerous able individuals whose careers have been damaged and even ended by inability to obtain federal, including NSF, support. The damage has been vast.

- I strongly recommend that NSF funding in organic chemistry not only be increased but skewed away from synthesis and toward physical organic chemistry.

- Chemists and physicists both pull their wagons in a circle when attacked; the physicists differ in that they fire their guns outward.

... Talks with DOE Chilled Trans-Border Plan

(Continued from page 1)

select "an unranked list of the best-qualified sites." The list, of no predetermined length, will be reviewed by DOE and announced in January. DOE's preferred site will be announced in July 1988 by DOE Secretary John S. Herrington, who last February astonished even the politically jaded mandarins of particle physics by proclaiming, "I wouldn't be surprised if we could get anywhere from a quarter to fifty percent of [the costs of] this project [from other countries]." (SGR February 15, 1987).

The final event on the DOE timetable is scheduled for January 1989, when the President is to announce the winner. That's taken to mean the man now in office, but since his successor will be inaugurated on January 20, 1989, it's generally assumed in Washington science-policy circles that the incoming Administration will put a hold on the process and undertake a review.

The proposed but excluded US-Canadian trans-boundary site, about 40 miles southwest of Montreal, had been likened to the French-Swiss border straddle of the CERN laboratory, near Geneva—a nice symbol of international comity in big science, as well as a practical way of doing business. But the idea was so coolly received by DOE officials when the New York backers informally discussed it with them earlier this year that a separate, and still surviving, collaborative site was proposed wholly within New York State. Located in NY's St. Lawrence County, about 10 miles from the rejected border site, it also has Canadian backing, but the degree

Chemists

(Continued from page 2)

1987)—was much on the minds of the organic chemists. Like many others, they view the expanding centers program as a powerfully favored competitor to "little science." Sounding skeptical, the report states that centers "can have a positive impact, if reliable mechanisms for monitoring their quality can be devised." But then it declares:

"However, American chemistry became the best in the world by a uniquely American style of research—the single academic scientist working in a teaching/research mode with a small group of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows. The NSF must be careful to prevent the trend toward multi-investigator grants from further eroding this winning single-investigator formula."

Will the report eventually achieve the goal of more money for organic chemistry? It looks doubtful, given the public-relations difficulty of linking that ancient discipline to some politically trendy line. Perhaps the best that can be expected is that this latest cry from chemists will prevent erosion of their support.—DSG

of enthusiasm for helping make rich American science even richer invites wonder.

The New Yorkers still express puzzlement about DOE's lack of interest in the trans-border possibility, since the Canadians were offering an assortment of sweeteners, including very cheap electric power (1.9 cents per kwh) that they estimated would save \$500 million over 10 years. But there's no real mystery about the rejection. The urgent political necessity of SSC politics is to inflame domestic pork-barrel passions while allaying Congressional concerns about costs by conjuring up a mirage of foreign participation. The performance to date has been excellent. There's been no debate about the SSC's priority on the long list of unmet needs in American science and related education. The issue has been tacitly defined by Congress and the press as an intense competition for the biggest public works project in the federal budget.

The Canadian border site was also rejected on two other grounds—both of which look spurious, though the issue, of course, is moot. One was that it did not provide for "An absence of cost to the government for land acquisition"—a matter that surely would have been resolved by NY State and its Quebec allies if that were an impediment to victory. And the other ground stated for rejection was tied to alleged lack of information assuring an "Absence of known unacceptable environmental impacts from siting, constructing, operating, and decommissioning the SSC."

Also rejected, all on grounds that included deficiencies in "land size and configuration," were three sites in Texas (Devers 1 and 2 and Liberty County), the Delta Area site in central Utah, and Washington State's Mattawa County site. A site proposed on Moon Area L-5 by a Paul Jablonka was rejected for being outside the US, as well as for other deficiencies.

Meanwhile, the Congressional politics of the SSC remain unsettled but far from unfavorable, despite foot-

(Continued on page 4)

ISSN 0048-9581

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1987

Editor and Publisher

Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher

Wanda J. Reif

European Correspondent

Francois Segulier (Paris)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscription: Institutions, \$225.00 (two years, \$395.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, D.C. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date.

Big Grants Pouring Into Academy's Institute of Medicine

The Institute of Medicine (IOM), the junior and long-impecunious appendage of the affluent National Academy of Sciences, is making rapid progress toward establishing a \$20-million kitty of its own.

Unlike its burly stable mate at the NAS, the industry-oriented National Academy of Engineering, the IOM has been fairly quiet about its rummagings for money. But grants, so far totaling \$10.5 million, have been rolling in since a capital campaign got underway about a year ago. Additional sums are expected soon.

The endowment campaign was started by Samuel O. Thier, who moved to the IOM presidency from Yale Medical School two years ago. When he arrived, the endowment stood at about \$100,000. Money without strings is much sought after in the Academy complex, since without it, the staff is confined to studies that suit the cash customers, mainly federal agencies. The career research professionals in the agencies usually adopt the hands-off role that the Academy expects of its clients. But with many Reaganite zealots on the loose in Washington, the Academy leadership has been working hard to raise independent funds.

The John W. and Catherine MacArthur Foundation has provided \$5 million, and the Commonwealth Fund \$500,000. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation offered \$5 million if other givers would match it with \$10 million. So far, the IOM has received match-

ing funds that have brought in \$3.6 million from the Johnson grant. In July, the A. W. Mellon Foundation awarded \$1 million, and last month, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation granted the IOM \$1.5 million.

Founded in 1970 as the health-policy arm of the NAS, the IOM was long a frail institution, and several years ago there was gloomy talk in the upper echelons about its prospects. Recently, however, it has been flourishing with Thier at the helm and with a growing market for its advice on AIDS, health-cost containment, and changes in medical technology.

In terms of funds, the IOM is still the smallest in the three-part Academy—Science, Engineering, and Medicine. The 124-year-old National Academy of Sciences has an endowment of \$62 million and an operating budget of \$120 million (most of it spent through the National Research Council, which performs most of the work in the otherwise honorary academies). The Academy of Engineering, founded in 1964, has a "general reserve" of \$14 million, and a direct operating budget of \$2.5 million—but most of its activities are budgeted through NRC.

As for the IOM, it is the most self-contained of the lot, and the only one of the three that selects members to get work out of them, rather to honor their past achievements. The budget this year is \$8 million—all spent for studies performed by the IOM, rather than the Research Council—and the prospects for big growth appear bright.

SSC

(Continued from page 3)

dragging on attempts to get a symbolic \$10 million in construction funds. The delegations of the states pursuing the project agree that there should be an SSC, while the doubters are scattered.

So far lacking in the process is an authorizing Act of Congress saying that there shall be an SSC. Though an authorization, a necessary prelude to appropriating money, won't be needed until it's time to begin construction—which is over a year away at the very earliest—backers of the SSC are nervous. They realistically say the project would be on much firmer ground if it had the formal backing of Congress, though it must be recognized that appropriations do not automatically follow authorizations, and frequently don't.

In any case, Chairman Robert A. Roe (D-NJ), Chairman of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, has introduced a bill (HR 3228) that would authorize the SSC. As of September 23, he had collected a winning total of 252 supporting signatures. There's talk of a Committee markup session in the next month or so to settle on a final version, and then the bill would

go to the floor, where passage is assured. A Senate counterpart bill has not yet been offered, but the prospects are equally favorable in that chamber.

Roe is in his debut this year as Chairman of a Committee that he long ignored until the quirks of seniority opened the top position. He is strongly committed to the SSC, according to people close to him. His position could be purely on the merits, but it is sometimes speculated that he's grooming himself as a champion of high-tech endeavors in preparation for a run at the New Jersey governorship, at which he failed once before. New Jersey hasn't offered a site for the SSC, but the project is so big and so hotly sought after that it offers attention and glory for anyone who emerges as its leading political shepherd.

The grand uncertainty then becomes money, which is in very tight supply as Congress seeks to compress appropriations within budget-deficit goals. But, at the outset, not much money will be needed to break ground and order components for the huge accelerator. When the budget curve starts its rapid rise, the advocates can invoke the argument that it is too late and too wasteful to turn back.—DSG

NIH Upholds Misconduct Charges in Cornell Case

After nearly six years of meandering inquiries, and one whitewash by the Cornell University Medical College, the National Institutes of Health has upheld most of the charges of scientific misconduct that a former Cornell researcher doggedly pressed against one of the leading members of the CUMC faculty.

In this lab-coat version of Bleak House (recounted in detail in SGR of November 1, 15, and December 1, 1987), the accused was Jeffrey S. Borer, MD, and the accuser was his one-time collaborator in cardiology research, Jerome G. Jacobstein, MD, now of Graduate Hospital, Philadelphia. The NIH investigation, conducted by inhouse staff and outside consultants, concluded in a report issued last week that "Borer's studies were characterized by a lack of attention to study requirements and generally accepted standards of recordkeeping."

It added that "There is no evidence of intentional misconduct on the part of Dr. Borer," but it recommended that Borer be kept under close scrutiny in future research dealings with the federal government (see box for the prescription, which is indeed humiliating for a senior researcher with an international reputation).

The NIH report also criticized Cornell for its once-over-lightly investigation and dismissal of Jacobstein's long-ago charges. While noting that in 1981 "there were no established procedures to guide NIH or research institutions in dealing with allegations of scientific misconduct," the NIH report and conclusions—endorsed by NIH Director James B. Wyngaarden—added: "Nevertheless, NIH staff believe that CUMC was remiss in both the conduct and documentation of its initial inquiry and did not realize the full implications of the investigation as it proceeded."

Regarding Cornell, whose performance in this episode has been despicable, the NIH report politely adds that "the hasty conduct of the inquiry [by a CUMC faculty panel appointed by the Dean], and the failure to document the findings until later, created understandable doubts about the institution's willingness to deal with a potential problem."

Last April, after a draft of the damning NIH report had been delivered to the various parties for comment, CUMC announced that Borer's performance would be subjected to a special review (SGR May 1, 1987). Noting that decision, the final NIH report states, "The committee believes these steps are commendable but might have been taken earlier in view of the information CUMC had in hand."

The report did not take note of the fact that NIH itself was long indifferent to Jacobstein's allegation, that it initially accepted Cornell's dismissal of the charges against Borer, and that the case was prodded to a conclusion only because Jacobstein diligently pursued it and spent some \$13,000 of his own money for legal

Borer's Six-Part Sentence

The following steps have been recommended to and approved by the Director of the National Institutes of Health following NIH's investigation of charges of scientific misconduct by Jeffrey Borer, MD, of Cornell University Medical College.

1. That you notify Dr. Borer of NIH concerns about the unacceptable standard of record-keeping, of collecting data, and of reporting results of the studies in question. This includes the unsupported statements made in the methodology section of the cold pressor [a cardiology-research technique] paper.
2. That you recommend to Dr. Borer that he immediately issue a clarification [of a paper that he published in 1984 in the *American Journal of Cardiology*, and that he previously "corrected" following a challenge by Jacobstein].
3. That for a period of three years, should Dr. Borer be considered for nomination to serve on any NIH peer review or program advisory committee, a copy of this decision document and related materials be provided to the officials considering his nomination prior to the issuance of an invitation. Further, that a copy of the investigational findings be provided to the Director of any Institute before funding Dr. Borer as a principal investigator or project leader.
4. That, in view of the fact that Dr. Borer has served on the Cardiorenal Advisory Committee of the Food and Drug Administration, a copy of this decision and related documents be provided to the [FDA].
5. That you inform CUMC officials of NIH concerns . . . about the institution's review of Dr. Jacobstein's allegations of misconduct.
6. . . . that you request a report [from CUMC] describing the result of the institution's review [announced in April] of a sample of Dr. Borer's research publications since 1981.

representation. When he decided to spend no more, his attorney, Professor Harold Green of the George Washington University National Law Center, continued his representation without charge.

The initial case centered on Jacobstein's contention that in 1981 Borer directed a medical student to sweeten a scientific abstract by misstating that "two independent observers" assessed images in a cardiology study, when, according to Jacobstein, only one, Borer himself, was

(Continued on page 6)

After Fraud Verdict, Pitt Repays NIMH Grant

The University of Pittsburgh has paid \$163,604 to the National Institutes of Mental Health (NIMH) in restitution of grants awarded to a former Pittsburgh professor, Stephen E. Breuning, whose published research has officially been branded fraudulent (SGR March 15, April 1, 1987). Meanwhile, Breuning is under investigation by federal authorities who have been asked by NIMH to consider criminal prosecution of the once highly regarded psychologist.

Breuning, who was an Assistant Professor of Psychology at Pittsburgh from 1981 to 1984, acquired national stature as an authority on behavior-control drugs for severely retarded institutionalized persons. His work was challenged by a research collaborator, Robert Sprague, Professor of Psychology at the University of Illinois, who became suspicious of Breuning's data and reported him to Pittsburgh and NIMH in 1983.

Pittsburgh University authorities turned their backs on the issue when Breuning resigned, and NIMH irresponsibly fiddled around for two years before taking Sprague's accusations seriously. Then, it appointed an outside investigating committee, which concluded last December that Breuning "has engaged in serious scientific misconduct." The panel also expressed concern about Breuning's research publications affecting the prescribing of tranquilizers in institutions in many states.

The investigating panel praised Sprague for pursuing the case, but NIMH had its own way of dealing with the Illinois professor who had confronted the drowsy organization with the messy problem of grantee Breuning. Despite a strong endorsement from an outside review panel, renewal of Sprague's own long-running NIH grant was "deferred" at the very last moment, thus threatening the continuity of his own research with re-

tarded children. Fortunately, the University of Illinois provided him with temporary support. And the National Institute of Child Health and Development, part of the National Institutes of Health, awarded him a \$350,000 grant, spread over three years, that assures continuation of his research. At last word, Breuning was employed as a psychologist at a state institution in western Pennsylvania.

An official in the Inspector General's Office at the Department of Health and Human Services told SGR that the Office is investigating the case with the Justice Department and that subpoenas have been issued, but she wouldn't say to whom.

DOE Labs Get Genome Role

A multi-billion-dollar project to map the human genome, and thereby provide work for the Department of Energy, is yet to be legislatively authorized, but DOE is already out of the starting gate. It's announced that Secretary John S. Herrington has directed the Los Alamos National Laboratory and the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory to get moving on the project.

The DOE announcement also says that Los Alamos "has been asked to explore the possibilities of cooperative research programs with the private sector to develop commercial applications of human genome research. These explorations," it says, "could lead to a pilot program which could be a model for other DOE laboratories." The announcement adds that "DOE's research on the humane genome stems from the Department's mission to evaluate the health effects of energy systems" and that the project is intended to "contribute to the nation's economic and technological competitiveness."

Cornell

(Continued from page 5)

involved. (The NIH review delicately states that the claimed presence of a second observer "enhanced the credibility of the report.") Jacobstein also charged that Borer incorrectly stated that patients in a test were "randomized or alternated," and that in a later paper, published in the *American Journal of Cardiology*, Borer incorrectly stated that a series of patients had received no medication for a given period prior to undergoing cardiology tests. In 1984 Borer submitted a letter of correction to the *AJC*. The NIH report, however, states that the letter "failed to identify the extent of the inaccuracy."

Jacobstein also brought a number of other charges concerning the scientific rectitude of Borer, who, back in 1981, was on the brink of being appointed to the

endowed chair he now holds, the Roland Harriman Professorship of Cardiovascular Medicine at New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center. With that prize looming, Cornell was apparently eager to expunge the charges against its young star researcher.

The NIH report concludes: "In summary, a review of these publications [by Borer] does not support a conclusion of deliberate misconduct. However, it does show a series of inexact and inadequate procedures. It is further noted that after problems were called to his attention, notably the failure to have all drugs stopped prior to tests, Dr. Borer did not adequately assess the magnitude of the problem."

Cornell has so far been silent about this blotch on its reputation and about the debt it owes it Jacobstein, who, after all, singlehandedly upheld the tradition of scientific integrity to which the university subscribes. Don't you agree, President Rhodes?

Semiconductors: Big US Spending, Little Return

*From the **Benefits and Risks of Federal Funding for Sematech**, a report by the Congressional Budget Office on plans to respond to Japanese semiconductor competition through a 13-firm US industrial consortium focused on R&D on manufacturing technology. Sematech would be financed from a variety of sources, at a total of \$250 million a year, including a proposed \$100 million from the US government.*

The debate over the possible federal role in Sematech may obscure the already substantial efforts of the federal government in semiconductor research. Federal agencies have been involved in the US semiconductor industry since its inception and have contributed to its competitiveness. Furthermore, federal agencies spend far more on semiconductor R&D than does the government of Japan, although not all US spending is related to commercial efforts.

Federal agencies will spend an estimated \$400 million to \$500 million in 1987 on research into semiconductor materials, designs, and manufacture. The largest amounts (over \$300 million) are being spent by the Department of Defense. Most of their research, however, has only limited short-term commercial potential. The Department of Energy's National Laboratories also have research programs . . . totaling \$80 million. The National Science Foundation spends \$30 million . . .

Although federal agencies already spend a great

deal on what appears to be support of the semiconductor industry, most of this money is spent to develop military and other noncommercial uses of semiconductors rather than to further manufacturing technology. The largest amounts of funds are spent to develop radiation-hardened integrated circuits, which are used solely in military or space applications, represent only a small fraction of semiconductor sales, and have only limited commercial potential . . . Thus, much of the federal research dollar . . . is spent acquiring knowledge of little immediate commercial relevance . . .

Outside of radiation hardening, which is primarily of federal use, much federally funded semiconductor R&D is basic research that will become commercially important only in the next century. By contrast, semiconductor companies concentrate their manufacturing R&D on solving current problems or providing background for their next manufacturing facility. The middle range of R&D—falling somewhere between the next factory and the next century—is thus often alleged to be missed by both federal agencies (and presumably their sponsored R&D at universities) and private firms.

The Sematech report (81 pages) is available without charge from the CBO, Publications Office, House Office Building Annex 2, 2d and D Sts. SW, Washington, DC 20515; tel. 202/226-2809. (The Publications Office also has available a list of CBO publications).

Howard Sets Up Institute to Study Minority Concerns in Science Policy

An institute has been established at Howard University, in Washington, DC, to study science, technology, and education issues of particular interest to minority groups.

The Institute, with a small startup fund from the Department of Energy, is headed by Melvin Thompson, Director of Development and Research Administration in the Howard University School of Engineering.

The founding of the new institute has been assisted by the Congressional Black Caucus and the Ana G. Mendez Foundation. Address: Minority Institute on Science, Space, and Technology, Howard University, 2400 6th St. NW, Washington, DC 20059; tel. 202/636-5077.

Medical School Association Names VP

Robert I. Levy, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences at Columbia University, has been appointed Vice President for Biomedical Research of the Association of American Medical Colleges. An AAMC announcement says that Levy will join the staff January 1,

and will be in charge of AAMC activities concerning national medical-research policy, and related activities.

The AAMC, based in Washington, represents 127 medical schools, 470 teaching hospitals, and 87 academic societies. At budget time, it is the nerve center of lobbying operations for the National Institutes of Health, in whose behalf it regularly spurs the biomedical community to pressure Congress.

To Order or Renew

**Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015**

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed
☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill
Institutional subscribers: one year, \$225.00 ☐
two years, \$395.00 ☐

(Overseas airmail, \$30.00 per year additional.)

Name

Address

Zip

In Print: New Reports in Science-Policy Field

The following publications are obtainable as indicated—not from SGR.

National Security Controls and University Research (11 pages), **Selected Readings** (116 pages), and **Statutes, Regulations and Policy Statements** (16 sections), prepared by the Association of American Universities; provides basic materials, useful for scientists, administrators, and especially university counsel, on federal laws, regulations, and practices related to academic science and information controls.

The three publications are available without charge from AAU, attn: Debra White, Suite 730, One DuPont Circle, Washington, DC 20036; tel. 202/466-5030.

Life-Sustaining Technologies and the Elderly (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01074-7; 459 pages; \$19.00), a major report from the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, reviews five medical technologies widely employed in the over-65 population, and concludes that little firm information exists about their use, also that reimbursement criteria are a major force in treatment decisions. Produced under the guidance of a 20-member advisory committee chaired by John W. Rowe, of Harvard Medical School, the report is a valuable compendium of data and analysis on the medical, legal, and fiscal issues of medical care for the seriously ill elderly.

Also from OTA: **Science, Technology, and the Constitution** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01086-1; 23 pages, \$1.50), a quick and superficial listing of sci-tech developments that may impinge on traditional concepts of Constitutional rights, eg, electronic surveillance vs. privacy.

OTA publications are available from the US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402-9325; tel. 202/783-3238.

Monitoring Foreign Science and Technology for En-

hanced International Competitiveness: Defining US Needs (92 pages), proceedings of an October 1986 conference sponsored by the Office of Naval Research and the National Science Foundation, with the focus on biotechnology, ceramics, and electronics in Japan.

Available without charge from NSF, Division of International Programs, attn: Mildred Bosilevac, 1800 G St. NW, Washington, DC 20550; tel. 202/357-9824.

Educational Achievement: Explanations and Implications of Recent Trends (105 pages), report by the Congressional Budget Office, reviews various analyses of fluctuations in standardized test scores since the 1960s.

Available without charge from CBO, Publications Office, House Office Building Annex 2, 2d and D Sts. SW, Washington, DC 20515; tel. 202/226-2809.

Evaluation of Research: A Selection of Current Practices (78 pages, \$11.00), report by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development on peer review and other assessment methods in Canada, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden, Britain, and US.

Also from OECD: **Reviews of National Science and Technology Policies: Netherlands** (142 pages, \$20.00), latest in OECD's series of reviews of national systems for supporting R&D; the Netherlands, especially strong in industrial R&D, is drawing wide interest because, as OECD notes, of its "impressive number of initiatives . . . in the field of science and technology policy" in recent years.

In the US, OECD publications are available from OECD Publications and Information Center, 2001 L St. NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC; 20036; tel. 202/785-6323. For list of sales agents elsewhere: OECD, Publications Service, Sales and Distribution Center, 2 rue Andre-Pascal, 75775 Paris, France; tel. 45 24 80 89.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INC.
SERIALS ACQUISITIONS
300 N. ZEEB RD.
ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

